

SECURE THE PERPETUITY OF THEIR DOMINION OVER THEIR SLAVES. The first was the immunity, for twenty years, of preserving the African slave trade; the second was the stipulation to SURRENDER FUGITIVE SLAVES—an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and, thirdly, the exacting, fatal to the principles of popular representation, of a representation for SLAVES—for articles of merchandise, under the name of persons. . . . In fact, the oppressor representing the oppressed. . . . To call government thus constituted a democracy, is to insult the understanding of mankind. It is doubly tainted with the infection of riches and slavery. Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is to establish an artificial majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress; and THEREBY TO MAKE THE PRESERVATION, PROPAGATION AND PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY THE VITAL AND ANIMATING SPIRIT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT."—John Quincy Adams.

J. B. YERRINTON & SON, PRINTERS.

WHOLE NUMBER 1204.

ed States to
uire me to
lave. If
or of any other tyranny, constitutes an abolitionist,
I, before God, believe myself to be that abolitionist.
So I was taught, and I shall not, probably, very soon

of positive
nothing
anything to
th Carolina

differ with them upon these points: but because in my judgment they did not make their opposition to the institution, but to the mode of carrying it out, I could regard the institution wherever the constitution gave us the right, without trenching upon it, which I trust I never shall. I admit that the States have the full control of the subject, and they can do with it as they think proper. I have never found me, nor have I ever seen any one, who could regard it as wrong to do anything adverse to your rights in the South; but we leave you to make such laws and regulations as you please with regard to this institution. We hoped, however, that you would see the necessity of a system of emancipation, and we hoped that a gradual system of emancipation, which made the vast difference between the progress of New York and Virginia, would be the

that the ques-
tion. I see, but is
falseness of his
of, sir, is my
before the
I, I do not
[Mr. Dixon]
you slave you
ly it is the
he last day.

me to ask
please.

Do they
God! Do
you speak
is what you
without influ-
as I with
equality of
of the De-
are created
under foot,

your own
is my docu-
ment. I never
but I have
a wrong for
where this
the prosper-
principles
manifesta-

fight, than that we must regard each other as ene-
 mies warring for these principles and for victory!
 If, Mr. President, you precipitate war on such a
 proceeding as that, it will not be liberty that will
 be in the nineteenth century. This is a progressive
 age; and if you declare war, you must be
 ready for the consequences. I should regret it. I
 am an advocate for the continuance of this Union;
 but I do not believe that this Union can survive
 ten years, after you repudiate this great Compro-
 mise.

SPEECH OF SENATOR SUMNER.

The Senate of the United States, Feb. 21st, Hon. CHARLES SUMNER delivered a highly elaborate and very eloquent speech against the Nebraska Iniquity, which we should be glad to lay before our readers entire; but we can find room, this week, for only the exordium:—

MR. PRESIDENT—I approach this discussion with awe. The mighty question, with untold issues, which it involves, oppresses me. Like a portentous cloud, surcharged with irresistible storm and ruin, it hangs over the whole land. I am painfully conscious how unequal I am to the occasion—how unequal, also, is all that I can say, to that I feel.

In denying my sentiments, however, I wish to speak of the subject in a friendly and unpretending manner, and without concealment or reserve. But if anything fell from the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. Douglas,] in opening this discussion, which might seem to challenge a personal contest, I desire to say that I shall not enter upon it. Let not a word or a tone be said to the effect that I assist to the maintenance of the transcendent theme, by the side of which the Senators and Presidents are but dwarfs. I would not forget those agencies which belong to this place, and are so well calculated to temper the antagonism of distant and remote communities, and to bring to the aid of all diversities of opinion, those who are the representatives of thirty-one sister republics, knit together by indissoluble ties, and constituting that Plural Unit which we all embrace by the enduring name of country.

The question presented for consideration is, "Is the Grand Jury, which has, on

er probably
ter one age
the world
unk to num-
That great
and, up-
akes airs to
the
ances you
is African-
whole terri-
and if it is
the belief of
whic who.
We

ed in our national history since the Declaration of Independence. In every aspect it assumes gigantic proportions, whether we simply consider the extent of territory involved or the public policy involved. The question is not whether it is a higher question—*that Question of Questions*, as fast as above others as Liberty is above the common things of life—which it opens anew for judgment.

It concerns an immense region, larger than the original thirteen States, and bordering with all the existing Free States, stretching over prairie, field, and forest—interlaced by silver streams, skirted by protecting mountains, and constituting the heart of the North American continent. Europe, Asia, and Africa, with their three Euro-

they are
an improp-
er system of
where they
they think to
they under-
nevertheless,
come to
can well
the market
ject of this
of this
with the
to fill the

man who is the
sopes of the
it is that I

you will :
Iying hirted
an abolition-
determina-
and to the
of slavery.

thers, which, without exaggeration, or even imag-
ination, may be likened to

the tree of life,
High eminent, blooming ambrosial fruit
Of vegetable gold.

It is with regard to this territory, that you are
now called to exercise the grandest function of the
lawgiver, by establishing those rules of polity
which will determine its future character. At
the twigs is bent, the tree inclines; and the influ-

ences impressed upon the early days of an empire—like those upon a child—of an inconceivable importance to its future well or woe. The bill now before us proposes to organize and equip two new territorial establishments, with governors, secretaries, legislative councils, judges, magistrates, sheriffs, and the whole machinery of civil society. Such a measure, at any time, would deserve the most careful attention. But, at the present moment, it justly excites a peculiar interest, from the effort made—on pretences unsupported by facts—in violation of solemn covenant, and of the early principles of our fathers—to open this immense region to slavery.

According to existing law, this Territory is now guarded against slavery by a positive prohibition, embodied in the Act of Congress, approved March 6, 1820, preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, as a sister State, and in the following explicit words:

"Sec. 8. *Be it further enacted*, That in all that Territory called by the name of *Missouri*, under the name of *Louisiana*, which lies North of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes of north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, SLAVERY AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, SHALL BE, AND IS HEREBY, FOREVER PROHIBITED."

It is now proposed to set aside this prohibition; but there seems to be a singular indecision as to the way in which the deed shall be done. From the time of its first introduction, in the report of the Committee on Territories, the proposition has assumed different shapes; and it promises to assume as many as Proteus; now, one thing in form, and now another, now like a river, and then like a flame; but, in every form and shape, identical in substance; with but one end and aim—its be-all and end-all—the overthrow of the Prohibition of Slavery.

Here, let it be remembered, that the friends of Freedom are not standing on any charge of aggression. They are now standing on the defensive, repelling the early intrenchments thrown up by our fathers. No proposition to abolish Slavery anywhere, is now before us; but, on the contrary, a proposition to abolish Freedom. The term Abolitionist, which is so often applied in reproach, justly belongs, on this occasion, to him who would overthrow this well-established landmark. He is, indeed, an Abolitionist of Slavery; let him be called, sir, an Abolitionist of Freedom. For myself, whether with many or few, my place is taken. Even if alone, my feeble arm shall not be wanting as a bar against this outrage.

On two distinct grounds, both strong against the deed, I arraign this proposition. First, in the name of Public Faith, as an infraction of the solemn obligations assumed beyond recall by the South on the admission of Missouri into the Union as a Slave State; Secondly, I arraign it in the name of Freedom, as an unjustifiable departure from the original Anti-Slavery policy of our fathers. These two heads I propose to consider in their order, glancing under the latter at the objections to the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories.

And here, sir, before I approach the argument, indulge me with a few preliminary words on the character of this proposition. Slavery is the forcible subjection of one human being, in person, labor, or property, to the will of another. In this simple statement is involved its whole injustice. There is no offence against religion, against morals, against humanity, which may not stalk, in the license of this institution, 'unwhipped of justice.' For the husband and wife, there is no marriage; for the parent, there is no assurance that her infant child will not be ravished from her breast; for all who bear the name of Slave, there is nothing that they can call their own. Without a father, without a mother, almost without a God, he has nothing but a master. It would be contrary to that Rule of Right, which is ordained by God, if such a condition, though mitigated often by patriarchal kindness, and by a plausible physical comfort, could be otherwise than pernicious in its influences. It is confessed, that the master suffers not less than the slave. And this is not all. The whole social fabric is disorganized; labor loses its dignity; industry sickens; education finds no schools, and all the land of Slavery is impoverished. And now, sir, when the conscience of mankind is at last aroused to these things, when, throughout the civilized world, a slave-dealer is a by-word and a reproach, we, as a nation, are about to open a new market to the traffickers in flesh, that haunt the shambles of the South. Such an act, at this time, is not only a crime, but a crime of the most odious character, a crime that palliates other offences, and encourages Slavery. This wrong, we are specially told, by those who seek to defend it, is not our original sin. It was entailed upon us, so we are instructed, by our ancestors; and the responsibility is often, with exultation, thrown upon the mother country. Now, without stopping to inquire into the value of this apology, which never adduced in behalf of other abuses, and which availed nothing against that kindly power, imposed by the mother country, and which our fathers, overthrown, it is sufficient, for the present purpose, to know, that it is now proposed to make Slavery our own original act. Here is a fresh case of actual transgression, which we cannot cast upon the shoulders of our progenitors, nor upon any other country, distant in time or place. The Congress of the United States, the people of the United States, at this day, in this vaunted period of light, will be responsible for it, so that it shall be said hereafter, so long as the diabolical history of Slavery is read, that in the year of our Lord, 1854, a new and deliberate act was passed, by which a vast territory was opened to its inroads.

Alone in the company of nations does our country assume this hateful championship. In despotic Russia, the serfdom which constitutes the 'peculiar institution' of that great empire, is never allowed to travel with the imperial flag, its ensigns to the American pretension into any of our newly acquired by the common blood and treasure, but is carefully restricted by positive prohibition, in harmony with the general conscience, within its ancient confines; and this prohibition—the Wilnot Proviso of Russia—is rigorously enforced on every side, in the remotest provinces, as in Bessarabia, on the south, and Poland on the west, so that, in fact, no Russian nobleman has been able to move into these important territories with his slaves. Thus Russia speaks for Freedom, and disowns the slaveholding dogma of our country. Far away in the East, at the 'gateways of the city,' in effeminate India, slavery has been condemned; in Constantinople, the queenest seat of the most powerful Mohammedan empire, where barbarism still mingles with civilization, the Ottoman Sultan has fastened upon it the stigma of disapprobation; the Barbary States of Africa, occupying the same parallels of latitude with the slave States of our Union, and resembling them in the design, the policy, and the productions, their climate, and the 'peculiar institution,' which sought shelter in both, have been changed into Abolitionists. Algiers, seated near the line of 36 deg. 30 min., has been dedicated to Freedom. Morocco, by its untutored ruler, has expressed its desire, stamped in the formal terms of a treaty, that the name of slavery may perish from the minds of men; and only recently, from the Day of Tunis has proceeded that noble act, by which, 'In honor of God, and to distinguish man from the brute creation'—I quote his own words—'he decreed its total abolition throughout his dominions. Let Christian America be willing to be taught by these examples. God forbid that our Republic—the heir of all the ages, foremost in the files of time—should adopt anew the barbarism which they have renounced!

As the effort now making is extraordinary in character, so no assumption seems too extraordinary to be wielded in its support. The primal truth of the equality of men, as proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence, has been assailed, and this great charter of our country discredited. Sir, you and I will soon pass away, but that will continue to stand, above impeachment or question. The Declaration of Independence was a Declaration of Rights, and the language employed, though general in its character, must obviously be restrained within the design, by the principles of the Declaration of Rights, involving no such absurdity as was attributed to it yesterday by the Senator from Indiana, (Mr. PERRY.) Sir, it is a palpable fact, that men are not born equal in physical strength or in mental capacities, in beauty of form or health of body. These mortal cloaks of flesh differ, as do these worldly garments. Diversity or inequality in these respects is the law of creation. But, as God is no respecter of persons, and as all are equal in His sight, whether Dives or Lazarus, master or slave, so are all equal in natural inalienable rights; and, pardon me, if I say, it is a vain sophism to adduce in argument against this vital axiom of Liberty, the physical or mental inequalities by

which men are characterized, or the unhappy degradation to which, in violation of a common brotherhood, they are doomed. To deny the Declaration of Independence is to rush on the bosom of the shield of the Almighty, which, in all respects, the present measure is calculated to offend.

To the delusive suggestion of the able senator from North Carolina, (Mr. Badger,) that by the overthrow of this prohibition, the number of slaves will not be increased, that there will be simply a beneficial diffusion of Slavery, and not its extension, I reply at once, that this argument, if of any value—not mere words, and nothing else—would equally justify and require the overthrow of the prohibition of Slavery in the free States, and, indeed, everywhere throughout the world. All the dikes, which, in different countries, from time to time, with the march of civilization, have been pointed set up against the inroads of this evil, must be removed, and every land opened anew to its destructive flood. It is clear, beyond dispute, that by the overthrow of this prohibition, Slavery will be quickened, and slaves themselves will be multiplied, while new 'room and verge' will be secured for the gloomy operations of slave law, under which fraternal labor will stop, and man and wife will be made sterile. Sir, a blade of grass would not grow where the horse of Attila had trod; nor can any true prosperity spring up in the foot-prints of the slave.

But it is suggested that slaves will not be carried into Nebraska in large numbers, and that, therefore, the question is of an impractical moment. My distinguished colleague, (Mr. EVANS,) in his eloquent speech, hearkened this suggestion, and allowed himself, while upholding the prohibition, to disparage its importance in a manner, from which I feel constrained kindly, but most strenuously, to dissent. Sir, the census shows that it is not of an impractical moment. Missouri, at this moment, with Illinois on the east and Nebraska on the west, all covering nearly the same spaces of latitude, and resembling each other in soil, climate, and productions. Mark, now, the contrast! By the potent efficacy of the Ordinance of the Northwest Territory, Illinois, the free State, while Missouri has 87,422 slaves, and the simple question which challenges an answer is, whether Nebraska shall be preserved in the condition of Illinois, or surrendered to that of Missouri! Surely this cannot be treated lightly. But for myself, I am unwilling to measure the exigency of the prohibition by the number of persons, whether many or few, whom it may protect. Human rights, whether in a solitary individual or a vast multitude, are entitled to an equal and unhesitating support. In this spirit, the flag of our country only recently became the impetuous panoply of an homeless wanderer, who claimed its protection in a distant spirit. It is this Missouri, constrained to declare that there is no place accessible to human avarice, or human lust, or human force, whether in the lowest valley, or on the loftiest mountain-top, whether on the broad flower-spangled prairies, or the snowy crests of the Rocky Mountains, where the prohibition of slavery, like the commandments of the Decalogue, should not go.

Now in view of the spirit of the age, in view of the sentiments of all Christendom upon the subject, in view of the fact that, within the memory of man now living, it was not so there, I think we have a right to ask our Southern brethren to yield this position; to renounce this claim. I think we have a right to ask the General Government not to turn to slavery such a paternal and beneficent countenance that it turns to liberty. (Applauded cries.) Our Southern brethren should understand that this anti-slavery sentiment at the North which is neither Abolitionism nor Free Soilism. (!!!) It is a principle, as well as a sentiment. Fed by the salient stream that flows from the mind and the heart, it is at once a logical deduction of the understanding, and an affirmative instinct of the soul. All the influences that build up moral, and spring from the catechism and the spelling-book, the church and the school, the Declaration of Independence and the New Testament. These all contribute to its growth. It shines upon us from every page of our country's history. This hall is the theatre of its triumphs. It is not extraneous, it is not tumultuous; it is deep, calm and strong. (Applause.) It is ready to act and to suffer and to sacrifice; it inspires to heroic deeds and heroic endurance. We cannot away with it if we would, we ought not to away with it if we could. It is an earnest, it is a manly, it is a Southern friend ought to respect, and which in their hearts they do respect. (Loud cheers.)

An Anti-Slavery sentiment at the North, which is neither Abolitionism nor Free Soilism—neither for God nor the Adversary—neither one thing nor another—How the Slave Power must tremble before it! O, Mr. Hillard, 'tarry at Jericho till your beard be grown'! For, as yet, you give no proof of moral manhood to the world. In your ethical treatment of slavery, you do indeed indicate that you are 'little better than a heathen.'

The Rev. Dr. Blagden, of the Old South Church, was the next speaker. Here is the substance of his remarks, uttered with a potency:

He spoke of the occasion of the meeting as one that justified a clergyman in participating in its proceedings, although generally abstaining from the public discussion of political affairs. He inquired, in the course of a mad and reckless ambition, if it were necessary to check men who were ready to violate the most solemn contracts with others, it is now necessary to curb those who would barter away our own rights, our own convictions, our own blessings, for the sake of office which would be degraded by their possession of it, and which could only be dignified by being purified from the foul stain they would leave upon it.

By the same law of duty by which we are bound to allow to others the political rights which were originally conceded to them, we are bound also to see that our own rights are left untouched; and if I have ever acted to defend the rights of others from invasion, we must now prove ourselves ready to defend our own! My own, do I say? I mean the rights of the North, the rights derived from the same compromises and agreements with those of the South, the rights of conscience, of religion and law. Let no man misapprehend the feeling of the North. They will do much for their law of God, their promises, their contracts, but they will not suffer others to violate engagements to them, for the sake of the high prize of the Presidential chair.

You will express, I doubt not, in your resolutions to-day, your calm, and therefore your unquerable determination to suffer no violation of ancient compact—compacts which are to be sustained on both sides, on either side, and having already given your part in the most trying circumstances, to sustain that which was opposed to your feelings and interests, you will claim with a voice of authority that cannot be resisted, that what is consonant with your feelings only, but with the best laws of man, and the perfect law of God, shall be maintained, as in times past, now and for ever.

What a speech for such an occasion! The mercury in this political thermometer falls below zero—nay, is frozen in the bulb. Mr. Eliot has the assurance to speak of the moral and religious excitement against the Fugitive Slave Bill as something to be congratulated upon, and that it has 'a high degree of sublimity.' The infamous Compromise of 1850 he says he felt bound to advocate, against the feelings and interests of his constituents, as it was inimical to all that is holy, just and humane—the very compromise which the South now maintains resolutely forever the compromise of 1820!

The first regular speaker was the Hon. J. Thomas Stevenson, who ingeniously said:—We had hoped, and we had a right to hope, [what fatuity!] that the concessions which were made, four years ago, to an institution WHICH NONE OF US CAN DEFEND, and the acquiescence of fair-minded [unprincipled and craven] men in them—as a settlement, had, like oil upon the waters, (1) stilled the tumult of theories, which seemed to threaten the wreck of the Union in its wrath. Mr. S. further said that it was the purpose of those concessions, to 'put at rest, perchance in its grave,' the anti-

slavery agitation! And now to be so cruelly disappointed, after such a wear and tear of conscience! In conclusion, he warned Southern men 'not thus, with suicidal hands, to remove the keystone from the centre of the arch, under which they themselves are standing; if they do, it will bury them in its ruins.'

Then, George S. Hillard next addressed the meeting. We have room for a single extract from his speech:—

Fellow-citizens, the Missouri Compromise, the Compromise of 1850, and the measure now before Congress, are all traceable back to the great, and fact of slavery. As by those who feel most strongly, and who talk most vehemently, upon this subject, I am deemed to be little better than a heathen, as I shall not be obnoxious to the charge of fanaticism or extravagance, I beg leave to say a few words upon this subject. The people of the South complain of the North, or of a portion of the North, for their conduct in regard to slavery. Though we think these complaints unreasonable, no reflecting man will wonder that they are made. Faithful to their own position, and not without a spirit of animosity, still less of recrimination, that we of the North, the moderate, the patriotic, the sober-minded, the union loving men of the North, have also our grievances on this score.—We have to set our lips firmly together, and to keep down some rebellious swellings of the heart. We have to endure, and to forbear; to remember, and to forget. We have sometimes been perplexed in the extreme. Our public men, especially, have often been set in a narrow pass between the mountain and the sea; called upon to respond to the claims of national patriotism at Washington, and then to meet the fiery denunciations of the anti-slavery sentiment at home, as living and the dead, here to-day, do testify. You, Mr. Chairman, are the living; and (pointing to Healey's painting of Webster,) there stands the dead! (Applause.)

Grievances that we have endured, I will not articulate; and, especially, I would be profitable at any time, and especially at this time, the occasion of this meeting. But I will not say what most tries our spirits, is the claim constantly put forth, the position so constantly taken by our Southern brethren. The ground on which they justify their whole policy of slavery propaganda is, that liberty in its essence is no better than slavery, that slavery has a right to go into Court, and to buy its way before God and man. Now this is hard to bear, and it is the harder to bear because it was not so once at the South. The Southern statement of the Revolution, and the men who succeeded them, the Southern men who controlled the public opinion in those days, and who were the fathers of the Union, they were not so. The strongest testimony against slavery will be found in the writings and speeches of Southern men. (Applause.)

Now in view of the spirit of the age, in view of the sentiments of all Christendom upon the subject, in view of the fact that, within the memory of man now living, it was not so there, I think we have a right to ask our Southern brethren to yield this position; to renounce this claim. I think we have a right to ask the General Government not to turn to slavery such a paternal and beneficent countenance that it turns to liberty. (Applauded cries.) Our Southern brethren should understand that this anti-slavery sentiment at the North which is neither Abolitionism nor Free Soilism. (!!!) It is a principle, as well as a sentiment. Fed by the salient stream that flows from the mind and the heart, it is at once a logical deduction of the understanding, and an affirmative instinct of the soul. All the influences that build up moral, and spring from the catechism and the spelling-book, the church and the school, the Declaration of Independence and the New Testament. These all contribute to its growth. It shines upon us from every page of our country's history. This hall is the theatre of its triumphs. It is not extraneous, it is not tumultuous; it is deep, calm and strong. (Applause.) It is ready to act and to suffer and to sacrifice; it inspires to heroic deeds and heroic endurance. We cannot away with it if we would, we ought not to away with it if we could. It is an earnest, it is a manly, it is a Southern friend ought to respect, and which in their hearts they do respect. (Loud cheers.)

An Anti-Slavery sentiment at the North, which is neither Abolitionism nor Free Soilism—neither for God nor the Adversary—neither one thing nor another—How the Slave Power must tremble before it! O, Mr. Hillard, 'tarry at Jericho till your beard be grown'! For, as yet, you give no proof of moral manhood to the world. In your ethical treatment of slavery, you do indeed indicate that you are 'little better than a heathen.'

The Rev. Dr. Blagden, of the Old South Church, was the next speaker. Here is the substance of his remarks, uttered with a potency:

He spoke of the occasion of the meeting as one that justified a clergyman in participating in its proceedings, although generally abstaining from the public discussion of political affairs. He inquired, in the course of a mad and reckless ambition, if it were necessary to check men who were ready to violate the most solemn contracts with others, it is now necessary to curb those who would barter away our own rights, our own convictions, our own blessings, for the sake of office which would be degraded by their possession of it, and which could only be dignified by being purified from the foul stain they would leave upon it.

By the same law of duty by which we are bound to allow to others the political rights which were originally conceded to them, we are bound also to see that our own rights are left untouched; and if I have ever acted to defend the rights of others from invasion, we must now prove ourselves ready to defend our own! My own, do I say? I mean the rights of the North, the rights derived from the same compromises and agreements with those of the South, the rights of conscience, of religion and law. Let no man misapprehend the feeling of the North. They will do much for their law of God, their promises, their contracts, but they will not suffer others to violate engagements to them, for the sake of the high prize of the Presidential chair.

You will express, I doubt not, in your resolutions to-day, your calm, and therefore your unquerable determination to suffer no violation of ancient compact—compacts which are to be sustained on both sides, on either side, and having already given your part in the most trying circumstances, to sustain that which was opposed to your feelings and interests, you will claim with a voice of authority that cannot be resisted, that what is consonant with your feelings only, but with the best laws of man, and the perfect law of God, shall be maintained, as in times past, now and for ever.

What a speech for such an occasion! The mercury in this political thermometer falls below zero—nay, is frozen in the bulb. Mr. Eliot has the assurance to speak of the moral and religious excitement against the Fugitive Slave Bill as something to be congratulated upon, and that it has 'a high degree of sublimity.' The infamous Compromise of 1850 he says he felt bound to advocate, against the feelings and interests of his constituents, as it was inimical to all that is holy, just and humane—the very compromise which the South now maintains resolutely forever the compromise of 1820!

The first regular speaker was the Hon. J. Thomas Stevenson, who ingeniously said:—We had hoped, and we had a right to hope, [what fatuity!] that the concessions which were made, four years ago, to an institution WHICH NONE OF US CAN DEFEND, and the acquiescence of fair-minded [unprincipled and craven] men in them—as a settlement, had, like oil upon the waters, (1) stilled the tumult of theories, which seemed to threaten the wreck of the Union in its wrath. Mr. S. further said that it was the purpose of those concessions, to 'put at rest, perchance in its grave,' the anti-

What right have you to call upon a man eighty-three years old to address you? Sir, I belong to other times. (A voice in the crowd said, 'No, the ears of the fathers are never deaf to the cries of their children.') I came here this evening, not only unasked, but with a determination not to speak; and, sir, when I shall say, will be very short, and it will run in a different strain from anything you may hear. I suppose that you expect me to say some thing about the enormity of this attempt to repeal the Missouri Compromise. Not a word, sir.—[Laughter.] I shall leave that to younger and abler men—to men who are in the current of the times, faithful to their own position. And, sir, they understand this to be the last act in that policy which has been in operation since the year 1820, and indeed from the commencement of the government. [Cheers.] There were two projects from the beginning. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of 'yes, yes!') Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or, if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South, that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the government in all times; and have they

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE CAUSE OF
WOMAN.

WOMAN.

At the Cleveland Woman's Rights Convention, the undersigned were appointed a Committee to obtain the preparation of two essays, one on the *Educational Opportunities of American Women*, and one on their *Business Opportunities*.

Even a superficial discharge of this duty must involve a wider investigation of facts than is possible for any one person. Agents have heretofore been engaged, in several of the States, to make inquiries. It

The following are the points on which information is especially solicited:—

1. *Educational Opportunities of American Women.*
 - (a) State legislation respecting Female Education.
 - (b) Statistics and conditions of Primary and Secondary Education.

(c) Do. of High and Normal Schools.
(d) Do. of Academies and Private Schools.
(e) Do. of Collegiate and Professional Institutions.

2. *Business Opportunities of American Women.*

(a) Statistics of actual employment of Women in various parts of the Union.

(1) Mechanical, (3) Mercantile,
(2) Agricultural, (4) Professionals.

(b) Wages paid to them, as compared with those of

(c) Employments which they might fill, but do not fill, and impediments in the way.

It is important that the information given should in all cases be as definite and systematic as possible. Facts are what we now aim at—not arguments, but the preliminary basis for argument. Let each person who reads this, ascertain what is within his or her reach, and communicate it within six months, if possible. For any very extensive or valuable communications, payment may in some cases be made. Any pamphlets, newspapers,

pers or circulars, bearing upon the above subject, will also be gladly received. Communications may be addressed (POST PAID, if possible,) to Rev. T. W. Higginson, WORCESTER, MASS.

LUCRETIA MOTT,
WENDELL PHILLIPS,
ERNESTINE L. ROSE,
LUCY STONE,
T. W. HIGGINSON.

January 15, 1854.

**ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION,
CINCINNATI, OHIO.**

To be held on **TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY**

the 11th, 12th, and 13th of April.

TO THE FRIENDS OF IMPARTIAL FREEDOM :

In sending out this, our Fourth Annual Call for a gathering of those who hate oppression and love justice, we deem the urging of any reasons for so doing wholly unnecessary. The importance of frequent meetings of the friends of this cause for deliberation, counsel and encouragement, is well understood ; as is, also, the utility of Conventions for pouring anti-slavery truth upon

the hearts of the people. We will only say, that since our last annual Convention, deeds have been done in our midst that warn us not to relax our efforts.

Our city, until within the past year, free from the deep disgrace of having sent back a poor fugitive to his chains, under the Fugitive Slave Act, now stands doubly degraded.

The constitutional rights of our colored citizens to protection have been officially outraged. By a decision of one of our Judges upon the Bench, they are told that they are to be supposed slaves until they have proved

their freedom; and the kidnapper, that he has nothing to fear from legal justice, if his victim has not free papers in his pocket. Thus, virtually, is Ohio made a Slave State.

During the past year, our State has been used more than ever as a hunting-ground, free to all who choose to run upon the trail of the poor black man; and if their efforts now being made by the slavecrats of Congress are successful, not a foot of the soil of the United States will be but may soon be trodden by a slave.

And still come wafted to us, on every breeze that

Among the places in which Anti-Slavery Conventions should be held, Cincinnati is prominent. Considering its location, its adaptation to the radiating of light of anti-slavery truth over the darker parts of the land, a more important point can hardly be found; and the success that has attended the efforts that have been made here, attests that there is not a more promising field.

We do, then, earnestly invite all who agree with us that slavery is a crime against God and man, and

willing to labor for his abolition, whatever other differences may exist among us, to come together again at the Convention, to deliberate upon the great work we have to do. And our platform will be free to all, whether friends or opponents, who desire candidly to discuss the great principles of the Anti-Slavery enterprise.

Confiding in the blessing of Almighty God, promising to every true and right effort, we hope to make an impression upon the moral atmosphere, that shall vibrate to the extreme verge of our slaveholding territory.

Board of Managers.

| | |
|----------------------|------------------|
| SARAH OTIS ERNST, | MARY MANN, |
| ANDREW H. ERNST, | MARY DEGEAW |
| JULIA HARWOOD, | JOHN JOLLIFFE, |
| EDWARD HARWOOD, | H. P. BLACKWELL, |
| CHRISTIAN DONALDSON, | MARY M. GUILD, |

ELIZABETH T. COLEMAN, N. M. GUILD.

The General Agent of THE LIBERATOR acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, for account the persons named:—

From Henry Wigham, of Edinburgh.
For James Gulland, Edinburgh.

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| " Christine Scott, | " | 10 |
| " Agnes Renton (a donation,) Edinburgh, | " | 10 |
| " Henry Wigham, | " | 10 |
| <i>From Andrew Paton, of Glasgow.</i> | | |
| For Alexander Hutchison, Glasgow, | | 10 |
| " John Neilson, | " | 10 |
| " John G. Crawford, | " | 10 |
| " Athanæum, | " | 10 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|
| " Wm. Robertson, " | 10 |
| " John Cairns, " | 10 |
| " Andrew Paton " | 10 |
| James Anderson, Kirkealdy, | 10 |
| <i>From Robert Smith, of London.</i> | |
| For John Mawson, Newcastle, | 10 |
| " Dennis McDonnell, London, | 10 |
| " T. F. Mollett, Esq., " | 10 |
| " Mr. Pocock, " | 10 |
| " Robert Smith, | £2 11 |

Mrs. ELEANORA JOHNSON, at No. 10, May street.
 Arch. MacALEXANDER is very desirous of employment.

plain sewing and dress-making. She is quite competent to do what she undertakes, and is very deserving of aid. Her husband went to sea more than a year since, and has not been heard from for nearly a year; leaving her and her boy to her sole care; and for several months during the autumn and winter, she was disabled for work by sickness. For any further information, inquire

of S. May, Jr., 21 Cornhill.

✎ The Printers of the *Liberator* wish to communicate with Rev. Wm. H. Jones, a colored preacher, who was travelling in this region last fall. Will any of our friends give us his address?

✎ SITUATIONS WANTED.—Three active colored men are now anxious to obtain situations as porters or laborers. Apply to **WILLIAM C. NELL, 21 Cornhill.**

ed and for sale by BELA MARSH, No. 25 Cornhill.
March 3. 8m

POETRY.

For the Liberator.

STANZAS.

Lord! in this trying hour,
Aid thou the patriot power!
Strengthen the brave—
'Gainst th' oppressors' reign,
May they not strive in vain—
Forth from his galling chain,
God free the slave!

Sun o'er him shineth dim—
Earth hath no hope for him,
None but the grave!
Fann'd by his struggling breath,
Free flow'ret withereth;
Life's but a living death—
God free the slave!

Curs'd in his cradle rest,
Bann'd from his mother's breast,
Soothed by a sigh;
Led first by shackled hand,
Scarr'd by the scorching brand,
How should he uprising stand,
'Neath the fair sky?

How can he lift his gaze
In the sun's beaming rays,
O'er the free wave,
Stained by that basest blot,
"Part of some household lot"—
Youth for him bloometh not—
Smiles but the grave!

Years bring but growing fears—
Manhood more bitter tears—
Life hath no aim;
Hope's but a sheathed sword;
Faith—a derided word;
Love—what is its reward?
Sorrow and shame!

Even on the sacred strand,
Hallow'd by Pilgrim band,
Tyrant hath been;
Veil, veil the sullied shrine!
Freedom no more doth shine,
Paled is her light divine,
Clouded the scene!

Fling ye the banner far!
To each dim, blushing star,
Splendor hath gone!
Ay! cast the stripes abroad!
Flaunt the free heaven of God!
Shade this degraded sod!
Freedom hath gone!

Upon th' oppressors' head,
God! thy just vengeance shed!
Cost down their pride!
Raving of freedom still,
Wielding the traitor's quill,
Working the tyrant's will,
Thee they deride.

Crush'd be their golden charm,
Crippled their crimson'd arm,
Scatter'd their power!
Let not thy glorious sun
Smile on the dark deeds done;
Give each down-trampled one
Freedom's fair dower!

Bless Thou the patriot few—
Stars in this midnight hue;
True men, and brave!
Fire by thy mighty word,
Gird with thy conquering sword,
Grant them their great reward—
God, free the slave!

Feb. 20, 1854.

ELODIE.

THE FREEMAN'S LAMENT.

Hang your harps on the willows, ye outcasts of Erin,
Whose weary feet rest on Columbia's shore,
Give a vent to your grief as we bring the sad ban in,
And rend all your garments—John Mitchell's no more!

In the dark vale of shadows his form is fast fading,
We would fain have retained him, but death claimed his fee,
Said all was his own that was found retrograding—
Then an inquest was held—Verdict, *Pelo de se*.

To the gloomiest limbo in all purgatory,
To the limbo of tyrants, his soul has now gone down,
There fetters and scourges are emblems of glory,
And friends like Legree bear the palm of renown.

But where Liberty's Eagle planes her bright pinions—
Where Hope cheered the world when a Washington led—
Where the victims of despotism hail Freedom's dominions,
There Freedom is shrieking, "John Mitchell is dead!"

WHAT SHALL WE POOR ONES DO?

The wintry blasts are blowing cold;
They search us through and through;
All work is dull, and food is dear:
What shall we poor ones do?

'Tis said the poor have many friends;
The saying may be true;
But if these friends lend us no aid,
What can we poor ones do?

Oh, may a wish to aid the poor,
Each noble heart imbue;
Nor let us ask without response,
What shall we poor ones do?

We labor hard, and labor long,
But wages small accrue;
When winds come whistling 'round our homes,
What shall we poor ones do?

Remember, whilst our toil is great,
Our comforts are but few;
These comforts daily rise in price—
What, then, can poor ones do?

Ye rich and blest, come visit us,
In lane and dark parvise;
Bring us a kind and cheering word,
And tell us what to do.

PROGRESS.

Onward! onward! raise the cry,
Let Progress be our watchword high!
Eager youth and bending age
Join the upward pilgrimage!

Though the Present darkness o'er us,
Though the Future glooms before us,
Onward! girt with truth and right,
Goads our unconquerable might.

Fear for no one, love for all—
'Justice, though the heavens fall!'
Onward! dread not despot's frown—
Truth can never be fettered down—
Onward! fear not bigot's ire,
Truth defies the stake and fire—
Tyranny may last a time,
Freedom yet shall reign sublime.

Rest not! until mind shall be
Like ocean, fearless and free.
Rest not! till each shackled limb
And men be brother-free men!
Rest not! till the world exclaims—
'Tide, rank, are empty names!
The peasant toiler at the plough,
The poet of the wearied brow,
Are nobles of their kind!
True worth alone shall passport be
To nature's noblest majesty—
The majesty of mind!

THE LIBERATOR.

GREAT DEBATE ON THE BIBLE,
BETWEEN MR. JOSEPH BARKER, OF OHIO, AND
REV. DR. BERG, OF PHILADELPHIA.

(CONTINUED.)

FIFTH EVENING.

[At six o'clock, the Hall was nearly full. The people were quiet and orderly, being evidently inclined to leave the debate to the champions.]

Mr. BARKER.—(Profound silence.) It seems necessary to state once more what is the point under discussion, and what it is not.

1. The question, then, at present under discussion, is the origin of the Bible. Our opponent says, it is of Divine origin; we contend that it is of human origin. This is all that we contend for at present. Mark! we do not contend that the Bible is wholly false or evil, but simply, that it is imperfect—of a mixed character, partly true and partly false—partly good and partly bad, like other human books. To prove that it is of Divine origin—that it is inspired, in the Orthodox sense of the word—the book must be proved to be all true, all good, without admixture of evil. On the contrary, to prove that it is of human origin, it is enough to prove that its contents are of a mixed character.

2. We have no wish to destroy the Bible, or to prevent people from reading it; we simply wish to show them that the book is not of divine authority; that they are never to believe what it says, unless it looks like truth; or to do what it bids them, unless they think it would be best to do so. We wish them to know that they have a right, that it is proper, and that it is necessary, that they should use the same liberty with the Bible that they do with the works of Newton, Locke, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Webster, taking all that looks like truth and that favors goodness, and leaving all that looks like falsehood or that seems to favor evil.

3. We have no wish to destroy the Bible, any more than we wish to destroy the Koran, or the Greek and Roman classics; we would have them all preserved. They are interesting and useful. They reveal to us the thoughts, the customs, the characters of past generations. They show us where the race of man once stood in politics, religion, philosophy and manners, and thus afford us an opportunity of comparing the world as it now is, with the world as it was long ago, and of finding out what progress it has made. Even the errors and follies, the crimes and cruelties, the impieties and blasphemies, the immoralities and obscenities, the contradictions and inconsistencies, the fables and the forgeries of those ancient books, are all of use, when regarded simply as monuments of antiquity, as revelations—not of the mind and will of God—but of the ignorance, and rudeness, and depravity of childish, savage, or half-barbarous times.

4. But those ancient books have much in them that is beautiful, tender, good. They have touching stories, beautiful fables, excellent poetry, noble sentiments, powerful eloquence, calculated to arouse and excite the mind, and promote our intellectual and moral development. The man who regards the Bible as a human production may read it with as much pleasure, and study it with as much profit, as he who regards it as a divine production. Nay, more. He can take all the good, and yet feel free to reject the bad. He can admire and love the beautiful, without feeling obliged to forge new rules of interpretation, and do violence to his common sense and conscience, in order to explain away the false, the foolish, the immoral, and the blasphemous portions, or to reconcile historical, theological and moral contradictions.

5. Our opponents say we reject the divine authority of the Bible, because its doctrines and its precepts are so decidedly against all vicious indulgences. The contrary, however, is the truth. One of the reasons why we reject the divine authority of the Bible, is, that its doctrines and precepts are too favorable to evil. If we wish to lie, and steal, and commit murder, or to kidnap and enslave our fellow-men, or to have a plurality of wives and a number of concubines, and to justify ourselves in doing so, where could we find a book better suited to our purpose than the book which tells us that men who indulged in all these vices were the friends of God, men after God's own heart, and declared by God himself to be the best and wisest men that ever lived? No, friends, the morality of the Bible is too lax. Even the morality of the New Testament, though often unnatural and extravagant, is not so strict, so pure, so perfect, as it should be. The morality of the New Testament, and even portions of the Old Testament, is better, purer, far better and purer than the morality of the Orthodox priesthoods and churches of the day, whether Popish or Protestant; but it is not half so pure, so perfect, as the morality of humanity—the morality of what is foolishly and falsely called Infidelity. Our morality, our law, allows no crime—tolerates no neglect of duty—provides for us no indulgences, no substitutionary victim, no borrowed garments of another's righteousness. It requires unchanging fidelity to duty, or compels us to endure the penalty in full, without the least abatement.

6. We say that the morality of certain portions of the Bible is better than the morality of the Orthodox churches and priesthoods. We go further. In some of the Psalms and some of the Proverbs, in portions of the book of Job, and in the writings of some of the prophets, we meet with passages so beautiful, so pure, so tender, and some so full of the spirit of humanity and philanthropy, that to admire them too much, or to prize them too highly, seems almost impossible. Happy would it be for the world if the churches and priesthoods would read and study them, and begin to reduce them to practice. In the Gospels and the Epistles, too, we find passages on charity and beneficence, on temperance and purity, on the subjugation of the animal part of our nature to the intellectual and the moral—passages on the duty of employing our talents and resources for the good of our fellow-men, and on our obligations to live and labor for the regeneration and salvation of our race, which, when favored with that liberal interpretation which the enlightened philanthropy of modern heresy sometimes gives them, are really excellent. We find much, also, in the examples of Jesus and Paul, and some of their early followers, as presented in portions of the New Testament, well worthy of admiration and imitation. All these things we prize and cherish. We wish both to practise them ourselves, and to bring all others to practise them. But when you have brought together every beautiful and valuable passage in the whole book, you have nothing like a perfect rule of life. You must look elsewhere, if you want to be furnished to every good work. You must study the human system—you must read the laws which are written on your organization, and the laws inscribed on the world around you, if you would learn your duty fully. In short, you must know the laws of your own being, and understand your relations to your fellow-creatures and to the world of things around you, if you would either know in which way you ought to go, or be supplied with sufficiently powerful motives to induce you to walk in that way.

Besides, the good parts of the Bible are so mixed up with inferior materials—the moral sentiments are so blended with low and selfish, with superstitious and unnatural, with illiberal and cruel, with blasphemous and inhuman doctrines, and so obscured with bad examples and immoral fables, that it requires a man of superior intelligence and moral powers to separate the good from the bad.

We have, however, no more sympathy with the pretended rationalist, who quarrels with the Bible on account of the good that is in it, than we have with the proud pretenders to superior piety, who make use of the Bible as a means of blinding and misleading their brethren, and of raising themselves to wealth and power, at the expense of their less crafty and more credulous neighbors.

We have shown that, though the Bible contains much that is good, there is nothing in it to prove that any

THE LIBERATOR.

portion of it is of superhuman origin; much less is there anything in the Bible to prove the whole of the book divine. Even the best parts are no more than the natural utterances of the human heart; while other parts bear marks of having come from ruff, uncultivated, ignorant, and barbarous portions of our race.

We have shown, that all Bibles in existence, whether called translations or originals, whether printed or manuscript, abound with contradictions, immoralities, blasphemies, and faults and errors of every kind.

We have shown, that the Bible in common use, (and it is as good as the Greek and Hebrew Bibles, and, in some respects, much better,) attributes to God the weakness and imperfections of humanity.

That it charges him with infinite injustice, and with horrible cruelties.

That it represents him as the patron of vice, and the special friend of enormous, prodigious criminals.

That it sanctions the grossest and most atrocious crimes, such as lying, theft, and murder; adultery, polygamy, and concubinage; kidnapping, slaveholding, and retail and wholesale slaughter; the slaughter of the innocent; the slaughter of helpless women and children; the slaughter at one time of thousands and tens of thousands of mothers and their children, in cold blood. We have shown that it sanctions every form of despotism, both in the State, the Church, and the family. We have shown that it abounds in contradictions; contradictions in theology; contradictions in morals; contradictions in history; contradictions of the most palpable and irreconcilable character. We have shown that it tells the most foolish stories, gives the most unphilosophical and childish accounts of the creation and the early history of our race; and we may add, now, that there is no kind of error or defect, to which the literary productions of men are liable, which may not be found in the Bible. It has errors of style, and errors of sentiment. It has errors in grammar, errors in rhetoric, errors in logic. It has geological and astronomical errors; meteorological and geographical errors; historical and biographical errors; errors botanical and zoological; chemical and physiological; chronological and arithmetical; medical, moral, and prophetic.

Every charge which we have made in former speeches, we have proved by unanswerable and unanswerable arguments. (Storms of hiss; cries of fair play! Moderator, let him go on.) I suppose none of you think your hisses and cries are any answer to my arguments. The answer must come from my opponent. (Renewed hisses.)

MODERATOR. ILLMAN.—All we ask of you, gentlemen, is, to grant us an impartial hearing.

MODERATOR. CHAMBERS.—Do beseech the audience to grant what they ask—it is but fair play.

Mr. BARKER.—Not one of our statements has been refuted; not one of our objections has been answered. No answer can be given to our arguments, which would not as easily justify any other book, however bad or obscene. There is no book that I have ever had the opportunity of seeing, that contains any thing worse than what is found in the Bible. There is no book—

1. That contains more glaring or more palpable contradictions.

2. There is none that contains more blasphemous representations of God.

3. There is none that contains things more indecent or obscene.

4. There is no book that contains things more unphilosophical.

5. There is no book that contains more immoral doctrines and examples.

6. There is none that contains more foolish or childish precepts and stories.

So that if it can be justified, any other book can.

If the Bible can be proved divine, any book can be proved divine.

What has my opponent done all this while?

He has not even defined his terms, or explained the propositions he has undertaken to prove. He was to prove the divine inspiration of the Bible; but,

1. He has never told us what he means by divine inspiration.

2. He has never told us what is necessary to prove the divine inspiration of a book.

3. He began an argument on the necessity of a divine revelation; but suppose the necessity of a divine revelation proved, it would be no proof of the divine inspiration of the Bible, nor of any other book.

4. The Doctor gave us a long discourse, professing on internal evidence; but, first, he gave us no definition of internal evidence, and he gave us no proof whatever, that what he adduced under that head was internal evidence, or any evidence at all, of the divine inspiration of the Bible.

5. But, stranger still, the statements of which his address on internal evidence consisted were bare assertions, utterly unsupported. He said the Bible stood alone in point of style, but he offered no proof of the statement.

He said the Bible was in harmony with all the discoveries of science, but he neither proved that it was, nor did he prove to us that, supposing it to be so, it would afford any proof of the superhuman origin of the Bible. The Doctor, therefore, has not advanced one single argument in proof of his position. He has his work, as the advocate of the divine inspiration of the Bible, to begin.

6. This is not all. We have given proof that the Bible is not of divine origin, that it is of purely human origin; that it bears all possible marks of having been composed and compiled by men, who were not only as liable to error as other men, but, to some extent, by men who were more ignorant, more under the dominion of error, than many other writers, whose works have come down to us from antiquity.

My opponent says the laws of Divine Providence, or the laws by which the world is governed, are given in the Bible, with a precision unequalled. We, however, cannot find them in the Bible at all.

The representations given in the Bible of the laws by which God governs the world, and the manifestations of those laws in the world, are flatly contradictory. The real laws of the universe, and the representations given of God's laws and doings in the Bible, are directly opposed to each other.

There are a few things in the Doctor's speeches which I would notice.

He says that the seven sons of Saul were hung up by way of righteous retribution for the murder committed by their father. Strange retribution, to execute one man for the crime of another! Suppose that our government should set upon this principle, permit thieves and murderers to escape with impunity, and after they were dead, should hang up their innocent sons and grandsons! Should we call it righteous retribution then? What a perversion of the moral sense there must be to attribute such atrocities to the Divine Being! It is an abuse of words to call such atrocities retribution. But the Doctor tells us that God is a sovereign, but a sovereign has no more right to do wrong than other people. He cannot abuse his power, and commit atrocities at pleasure.

But the same principle is carried out in Nature, we are told. The drunkard and sensualist entail disease upon their posterity, it is said. Yes, but is God answerable for the doings of drunkards and sensualists? It is blasphemy to charge them upon God. As well may we charge him with the sins of all men. The drunkard is as really the cause of the disease which he transmits to his children, as the murderer is the cause of the death of his victim. The crime does not cease to be mine, because I commit it on the babe before it is born. Give God the credit of his beneficent laws, but do not charge him with men's violations of those laws.

The Doctor says, "God's ways will not square with our ideas of justice." Portions of the Bible say they will. The Bible itself says, "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the righteous, are both an abomination to the Lord." Prov. 17:15.

The Doctor charged the anonymous letter he read on some unbeliever. I should have given it a different

THE LIBERATOR.

percentage. However, it had nothing to do with the question.

As to capital punishments, I suppose he may find persons opposed to them among Christians, as well as among others.

As to those who pity the murderer, instead of pitying the murdered, if there be such people, we should like them no better than our opponent does.

Our view of punishment is this, that it should be adapted to secure society; and, secondly, to reform, if possible, the criminal. We question the wisdom of cherishing revenge.

We would kill a man without hesitation who should attempt to murder another, if we could not otherwise prevent the murder; but when we had got the murderer safe in our hands, we should feel it a violation of the law of God, in our nature, to kill him in cool blood.

The Doctor asks, What is a man to do if the light within becomes darkness? We answer, What can be done in the case of a man who turns the Gospel into a patron of licentiousness? They must both take the consequences.

But where there is no law, there is no transgression, says the Doctor. But in the case supposed, there is a law, only the man refuses to read and obey it.

Dr. Berg said he made complaints against the ordinances of Jehovah. I only complained against those who attribute to Jehovah ordinances which are not his. The Doctor says, if I will account for the introduction of death into the world, he will thank me. But we had better have no account of the matter at all, than one which is manifestly false and blasphemous.

At the close of his last speech, the Doctor took up the account of the creation in Genesis, and said that the Bible does not teach that the world is 5550 years old; that it does not say that the world was made in six days, but 'in the beginning'; and he asked me, with a triumphant air, to tell when that beginning was, intimating that it endured endless ages. He and his friends seemed to think their retort a triumph. We answer, that the Bible expressly teaches that the 'beginning,' when the heavens and the earth were made, was a part of the six days. This is plainly the meaning of the passage in Genesis. Other passages, however, are more explicit still. Look at Exodus 20:9, 11:—

'Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.'

And again, look at Exodus 31:17:—

'It (the Sabbath) is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day, he rested, and was refreshed.'

Before these authorities, the Doctor's triumph comes to a close. The Bible itself, his pretended infallible book, declares that his interpretation is wrong. [Interruption by cries of 'Time, time!'] Not one of the statements he has made in favor of the Bible has been proved—not one of those which we have made has been refuted. [Cries of 'Time, time!'] Mr. Barker turned to Moderators, who decided that only a few moments remained. No allowance had been made for time lost in interruption. [Cries of 'Berg, Berg!']

Dr. BERG.—(Two rounds of applause and cheers.) With your permission, I will now notice my opponent's speech of last Friday evening, and will endeavor to straighten matters with him in this casting up of accounts.

He said, on Friday, that the name of the Supreme Being, whose existence he recognises, is God; need I remind him that this is a generic term, abstract instead of concrete? Suppose I should ask him his name, and he should answer me, Mankind; would the reply be sufficient? Every man has his own individual name, and the heathen gave names to each of their gods; why cannot he, therefore, name his? My God, the God that Christians worship, has revealed his title—it is Jehovah, and he says, 'Beside me there is no other.' It is true that the 'heavens declare his glory, and the firmament sheweth his handy work,' but do they reveal all the attributes of God? It is true that the planets show his glory—

'For ever singing,' as they shine,
The hand that made us is divine.'

But they do not reveal all his attributes. God manifests not only in nature, but in grace, and in his son Jesus Christ, his three-fold character. It is our God who has made the heavens with his glory; it is he who has stretched out the sea; and it is he who hath clothed the dry land with its various beauty. Let not my opponent confound his nameless God with ours. Who is his God? Where is he? If my opponent will not answer, I will undertake to do it.

He says that Job was a Pagan Deist. Inimitable discovery! How, then, is it, that he has written an epic poem, which, for sublimity of thought, grandeur of expression, transcendent pathos and beautiful imagery, surpasses every work of merely human genius? Has a Pagan Deist! How happens it, then, that he has put on record those beautiful words, which my opponent and myself have so often heard repeated by the dying Christian—'For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth?' Job 19:25, 26. No; Job was neither a Pagan Deist nor an Infidel Deist. (Slight applause.) He was an humble believer in Christ. And now, mark! the oldest book extant was written by a man who believed in the coming of the Messiah. Herein is a clear indication of the Son of God. Upon its pages is stamped the seal of Divine Intelligence, to prove, in the face of all who reject, that the Bible is indeed the Book of God.

My opponent offered an elaborate eulogy on Thomas Paine. It was in sad contrast with his enunciations on the Bible, but worthy of the sinking cause which my opponent is endeavoring to save from merited perdition. Thomas Paine, the loathsome drunkard, the filthy debauchee, who covered all things holy with the slime of his ravings, has found a eulogist. My opponent has abandoned his defamings of the Scriptures for the purpose of extolling as base a miscreant as ever upheld the flagstaff of Infidelity. (Applause, hisses—renewed applause and cheers.) My opponent says that Paine is slandered; that a record of his dying moments is a perversion of the truth. Was he there? If not, what right has he to contradict those who were, and who are quite as worthy of credit as he ever can be?

Mr. Barker decried on the horrors of the hell into which the Bible says, 'the wicked shall be turned, and all the nations that forget God.' He represents Christians as believing that the vast majority of mankind will be condemned to intolerable torment. Christians believe no such doctrine. The vast majority of mankind die in infancy. It is true, that all men are by nature children of wrath; but if the child is a partaker of the condemnation by Adam, he is also a partaker of the salvation by Christ; and it is written that of such is the kingdom of heaven. But it is true that the wicked shall be turned into hell. Jehovah is the God of love; and he says that heaven shall not be polluted by those who are defiled with guilt; but that all the blessed will be there in washed robes. What father would bring the plague of leprosy into his family, and make of his home a lazaretto? Into the portals of heaven, sin and death cannot enter; and, therefore, the sinner who rejects God and despises Christ cannot enter. Hell is the moral lazaretto of the universe. My opponent says that God never forgives sin. I say, out of Christ, never—out of him, there is no Savior, no heaven, no cross, no crown. What he says is horrible. Does my opponent expect God to measure His hatred of sin by his love of sin? 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son' to take away the sin of the world. And the banishment of sinners suffices to set before the universe the tremendous truth, that man cannot defy Him, and trample on the cross, with impunity.

My opponent speaks of the Savior which every man has within him. He says that a cut finger will heal, and gives you other evidences of the recuperative energy of Nature. But how does the soul show it has the same? Does it bleed? No. Conscience will resent

the wrong. A thief picks your pocket; his conscience troubles him, and all is right. He keeps your money, because, forsooth, he has a Savior within himself. (Laughter and applause.) Suppose his conscience is seared, he still has his Savior within himself, and your money too. He says that the penalty of the sting of conscience is one part of the moral law. How long will this sting last? Until the sin is healed. Then must conscience be ever sting; and as all men have sinned, my opponent's argument is a strong one in favor of an eternal hell.

My opponent says that knowledge is progressive. How, then, did the Jews do what he charges them with—murder the Pagan, who lived before them? If the law of progress was universal, the Malays would not have remained in the same condition for centuries while the Sandwich Islanders have advanced in civilization. He should blush at the absurdity of his assertion. (Tremendous applause.)

He speaks of the account of Abraham, who had a child born to him in his old age. His objection is feeble as infant silliness can make it, for God is almighty, and if he had chosen, he could, out of the very stones of the street, have raised up children unto Abraham.

One more remark, and I come to the matter of the ark. I had hoped to have had the happiness of congratulating my opponent on making one speech without referring to Solomon's seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines; and in his last, I thought he would keep clear of it, and, in fact, he only quoted it. (Laughter and applause.) He reminds me of the Scotch parson, who could never preach a single sermon without some allusion to Uriah, the Hittite.

Once the elders of his church, wishing to cure him of the habit, called on him, and begged him to abstain, and he promised he would. In his next sermon, he got along pretty well until the close, when he could not refrain from breaking out with, 'And now, brethren, ye'll bear in mind the case of Bathsheba—oh, it's all out.' (Laughter and applause.) The case of David offers no difficulty. He not only sinned in the matter of Uriah, the Hittite, but he himself confesses that his iniquities were more than he could number. We would interpret the Bible as a whole. Its author has given us reason to be exercised.

Like all men, he fell short, and needed forgiveness; and the sin in the case of Uriah is the only one mentioned, because that sin left the stain of infamy upon his reign, and descended to his posterity. My opponent may say it is unjust to visit the sin of the fathers upon the children, but the fact is so, and he may settle its injustice with his nameless God. I could not but observe how his rank atheistical doctrine glided again into the drunkard's child is not owing to God, but to the crime of the drunkard. Who instituted the law by which the drunkard does entail disease upon his children? (Loud applause.) My opponent is like the Hindu, who thinks the world rests on an elephant, and the elephant upon a tortoise. He may settle the principle with his God, and when he makes the fact square with his sense of justice, he will get along. Of one thing we are sure, God's ways are not Mr. Barker's ways, and his thoughts are not Mr. Barker's thoughts; and I suspect that Mr. Barker's admiration is not at all essential to His government or happiness. (Applause.) And now as to the ark. I must express my surprise at the want of fairness shown by Mr. Barker, in his statements; the exposure of which, he must have known, would consign him to merciless ridicule and contempt. I will undertake to prove that the ark was not only large enough and to spare, to accommodate all the animals mentioned, but also my opponent and all the members of the Sunday Institute into the bargain; (laughter and applause, and a few hisses)—though I rather suppose that my opponent and his friends, if they had lived in that day, would have been outsiders. (Tremendous cheering.) I might insist on taking the Egyptian cubit as the standard of measurement, but I will accept that of my opponent. The ark, then, was 450 feet long, 75 feet wide, and 45 feet high, giving a capacity of 1,518,750 cubic feet. This was a small vessel, if we take the modern mode of measuring, of 43-413 tons. Now, if we remember that a first-rate man-of-war is only of between 2,200 and 2,300 tons, the ark would have had the capacity of storage of 18 ships-of-the-line, each of them capable of containing 20,000, with sufficient provision for six months' consumption, besides an enormous weight of cannon. My opponent said that there were 500,000 species of animals, to each of which he supposed that one cubic yard should be assigned. I know not which most to admire, his estimate of your credulity, or the courage he shows in coming before such an intelligent audience as this with such an assertion. Buffon says there are only from 200 to 250 species of animals, from the mouse to the elephant. Carver, who has been quoted, includes fishes in his estimate. Well, we may as well leave them overboard, for they will live quite as well in the water as in Noah's ark. (Laughter.)

We may dispose in the same way of the amphibious animals, who could find a floating log or tree to rest upon. (Laughter.) All the animals we care for, are those inhabiting dry land. We have thus part of Mr. Barker's cargo out, as not included among the beasts, fowls and creeping things of the original invoice. He wished to allow a cubic yard apiece to each of his half million of species. Why, a pair of turkeys would live with comfort in that space, but the creeping things form considerable items in the number on the bill of lading; and the curious in such matters know that whole regiments of creeping things can be accommodated in very circumscribed limits. (Laughter and cheers.) Just think of allowing a cubic yard to insects discoverable without grandmother's spectacles. (Laughter.)

The large animals are very small in number, and the small animals were an immense number. We have, for this calculation, taken our opponent's own standard, but we might have taken the Egyptian measure, which would give us 2,243,521 cubic feet. This would give us large space, not only for the animals, but for provisions for a year or eighteen months. My opponent spoke as if there was but one window, and that only a cubic wedge. Indeed! Where did he learn this? Did he consult the spirits? He quoted the Bible, but even that can be quoted not exactly in its right sense. What does it say?

'A window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above; and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof; with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.' Gen. 6:16.

The word window is used to signify a means of admitting light. At the top, it was reduced to a cubit in size. It was in the roof of the ark, in which was set this transparency or transparency—[Time up. Dr. Berg sat down amid tremendous cheering.]

MR. BARKER'S LECTURES.

MR. GARRISON:—

DEAR SIR:—I see in the last LIBERATOR, an article complimentary to Mr. Barker in his controversy with Dr. Berg. I care not who may carry off the laurels from that contest, but I am not willing that the claims of the Bible should be thought damaged thereby. Dr. Berg cannot be accepted, by any true friend of the Bible, as its champion, but must be denounced as more infidel and more dangerous in his infidelity than Mr. Barker—more infidel, because infidel to humanity as much as to God, and more dangerous, because he adds hypocrisy to infidelity, as do all who pervert the Bible to the support of popular sin.

Against such Bible advocates, Mr. Barker may gain easy victories; for it is not the Bible which they care to defend, but that interpretation